

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/646,872	NOMURA, HIROSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Arthur A Smith	2851	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arthur A Smith. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Bill Boshnick. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 28 December 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Model of present claimed invention as well as a model of the prior art.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nomura et al. (US 2001/0024573 A1).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant demonstrated that the prior art failed to teach at least wherein the second ring contacts the annular ring engagement surface and further wherein a biasing arrangement configured to urge the first and second ring in generally opposite directions and bias the first and second ring engagement surfaces into contact with the annular ring engagement surface. The examiner agrees with the applicant and will withdraw the rejection. The examiner will however, do an update search before deciding on allowance. .